

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

PAWS UP RANCH, LLC, et al.,
Plaintiff(s),
vs.
CHRISTOPHER GREEN, et al.,
Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:12-cv-01547-GMN-NJK
ORDER DENYING STIPULATION
TO EXTEND
(Docket No. 324)

Pending before the Court is a stipulation to extend the deadline for Defendant Green to file responses to various discovery requests. Docket No. 324. Local Rule 7-1(b) provides that “[n]o stipulations relating to proceedings before the Court except those set forth in Fed. R. Civ. P. 29 shall be effective until approved by the Court.” Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 29, “the parties may stipulate that [the] . . . procedures governing . . . discovery be modified.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 29(b). The Advisory Committee’s note to the 1993 amendment of Fed. R. Civ. P. 29 explains that:

The litigants ordinarily are not required to obtain the Court's approval of these stipulations[; however,] . . . approval must be obtained if a stipulation to extend the 30-day period for responding to interrogatories, requests for production, or requests for admissions would interfere with dates set by the Court for completing discovery, for hearing a motion, or for trial.

Counsel are encouraged and permitted to agree on extensions encompassed by Fed. R. Civ. P. 29(b). *See, e.g., Gen. Cigar Co. v. Cohiba Caribbean's Finest, Inc.*, 2007 WL 983855, at *1 (D. Nev. Mar. 30, 2007). Here, the discovery deadline is January 13, 2016. Docket No. 307. The parties' stipulation regards extending the time for Defendant to respond to Plaintiff's interrogatories to December 2, 2015.

1 Docket No. 324 at 1. The stipulation clearly falls within Fed. R. Civ. P. 29, and does interfere with any
2 Court-set discovery deadline, motion hearing, or trial. Accordingly, because the Court's approval is not
3 required, the stipulation is hereby **DENIED** as moot.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 DATED: October 29, 2015

6 
7 NANCY J. KOPPE
8 United States Magistrate Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28